## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

Ciara Stafford	1
Plaintiff(s),	Civil No.
v.	Judge
Fiserv Solutions LLC, et al.	
Defendant(s).	
NT CERTIFICATION¹ OF THE CITIZ	ZENSHIP OF THE PARTIES IN DIVERSITY CAS
AINTIFF(S):	
ura Stafford  X Individual <sup>3</sup> Comparation <sup>4</sup>	State(s) of Citizenship

G' G, CC 1	X Individual <sup>3</sup>	State(s) of Citizenship
Ciara Stafford	Corporation <sup>4</sup>	Pennsylvania
	Partnership <sup>5</sup> Limited Liability Company <sup>6</sup>	
		State(s) of Citizenship
	Corporation	
	Partnership Limited Liability Company	
	Individual	State(s) of Citizenship
	Corporation	
	Partnership Limited Liability Company	
In cases where one or n	nore Plaintiffs are partnerships or LLCs,	list all partners or members and thei

In cases where one or more Plaintiffs are partnerships or LLCs, list all partners or members and their citizenship. This space should also be used where there are more than three Plaintiffs.

DEFENDANT(S):		
Fiserv Solutions LLC	☐ Individual ☐ Corporation ☐ Partnership	State(s) of Citizenship Wisconsin
X Limited Liability Company	1 1 **	
Clover Network, LLC  Clover Network, LLC  Corporation  Partnership  Limited Liability Com  Individual  Corporation	Corporation	State(s) of Citizenship
		Delaware, Wisconsin
	Corporation	State(s) of Citizenship
	Partnership Limited Liability Company	
Member(s) of Fiserv S Member(s) of Clover Member(s) of First Da	Solutions LLC: Fisery, Inc. (Wisconsin Network, LLC: First Data Merchant Seata Merchant Services LLC: (Delaware)	e than three Defendants.  n) ervices LLC
AMOUNT IN CONTRO	OVERSY:	
Amount in controversy,	exclusive of interests and costs: <sup>7</sup> Exces	ss of \$75,000
	calculation of amount in controversy. I or other paper,"8 include the ECF citati	
Against Discrimination	nsatory damages, back pay, and front pon. Plaintiff's annual salary was approxione will exceed the jurisdictional thresh	imately \$70,000. Thus Plaintiff's

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746 and Fed. R. Civ. P. 11, I certify that the foregoing is true and correct.

	Date
Appearing on behalf of Plaintiff(s)	
/s/ Erik P. Pramschufer	Date 10/22/2024
Appearing on behalf of Defendant(s)	

This form may be replicated as necessary. Additional sheets may be added.

<sup>3</sup> 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a)(1); *McNair v. Synapse Grp. Inc.*, 672 F.3d 213, 219 n.4 (3d Cir. 2012) (citing *Krasnov v. Dinan*, 465 F.2d 1298, 1300 (3d Cir. 1972) ("[M]ere residency in a state is insufficient for purposes of diversity [of citizenship].")).

<sup>4</sup> 28 U.S.C. § 1332(c)(1) ("[A] corporation shall be deemed to be a citizen of every State and foreign state by which it has been incorporated and of the State or foreign state where it has its principal place of business . . ."); *S. Freedman & Co., Inc. v. Raab*, 180 F. App'x 316, 320 (3d Cir. 2006) (explaining that "[i]n order to adequately establish diversity jurisdiction, a complaint must set forth with specificity a corporate party's state of incorporation and its principal place of business," and affirming dismissal of complaint alleging that corporation maintained "a principal place of business," rather than "its principal place of business" (quoting *Joiner v. Diamond M Drilling Co.*, 677 F.2d 1035, 1039 (5th Cir. 1982))). The parties are directed to list the state of incorporation and principal place of business of the corporation.

<sup>5</sup> A partnership, as an unincorporated entity, takes on the citizenship of each of its partners. *Zambelli Fireworks MFG*. *Co. v. Wood*, 592 F.3d 412, 419 (3d Cir. 2010) (citation omitted). The parties are directed to list each partner and its citizenship.

<sup>6</sup> The citizenship of an LLC is determined by the citizenship of each of its members. *Lincoln Ben. Life Co. v. AEI Life, LLC*, 800 F.3d 99, 105 (3d Cir. 2015). The parties are directed to list each member and its citizenship.

<sup>7</sup> 28 U.S.C.A. § 1332(a) ("The district courts shall have original jurisdiction of all civil actions where the matter in controversy exceeds the sum or value of \$75,000, exclusive of interest and costs . . ."); *Auto-Owners Ins. Co. v. Stevens & Ricci Inc.*, 835 F.3d 388, 395 (3d Cir. 2016) ("[T]he party invoking diversity jurisdiction . . . bears the burden to prove, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000." (citing *Judon v. Travelers Prop. Cas. Co. of Am.*, 773 F.3d 495, 506–07 (3d Cir. 2014))).

\_\_\_\_

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> As of March 14, 2022, the Court has updated its preferences to require that this Joint Certification be executed by the parties and filed in diversity cases within 30 days of the filing of a Notice of Removal, or where the Complaint is initially filed in this Court, 30 days after an answer, other responsive pleading, or motion has been filed.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Parties may not consent to jurisdiction, and federal courts have an independent obligation to address issues of subject matter jurisdiction *sua sponte* and may do so at any stage of the litigation. *Zambelli Fireworks MFG. Co. v. Wood*, 592 F.3d 412, 418 (3d Cir. 2010); *Lincoln Ben. Life Co. v. AEI Life, LLC*, 800 F.3d 99, 104 (3d Cir. 2015) ("The principal federal statute governing diversity jurisdiction, 28 U.S.C. § 1332, gives federal district courts original jurisdiction of all civil actions 'between . . . citizens of different States' where the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000. For over two hundred years, the statute has been understood as requiring complete diversity between all plaintiffs and all defendants, even though only minimal diversity is constitutionally required." (citation omitted)); *Wisconsin Dep't of Corr. v. Schacht*, 524 U.S. 381, 382 (1998) ("The presence of the nondiverse party automatically destroys original jurisdiction: No party need assert the defect. No party can waive the defect or consent to jurisdiction. No court can ignore the defect; rather a court, noticing the defect, must raise the matter on its own." (citation omitted)).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> 28 U.S.C. § 1446(b)(3).